

To: Alexander, Shanna[Alexander.Shanna@epa.gov]
From: Amoroso, Cathy[/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=C5033745779E4121B626D62341A9B89C-AMOROSO, CATHY]
Sent: Tue 11/9/2021 1:20:23 PM (UTC)
Subject: FW: ORR risk based instream values vs CWA guidance defaults
[Fish Meals and PRG Summary Approach 19OCT21.docx](#)
[Fish Meals with BCK 3.3 Stats 13OCT2021 \(updated\).xlsx](#)
[ORR Fish Default vs Site-Specific ISWQVs draft 3NOV2021.xlsx](#)

Please disregard my earlier email. Looks like Glenn already answered the question.

From: Adams, Glenn <Adams.Glenn@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 9, 2021 8:16 AM
To: Torres, Ramon <Torres.Ramon@epa.gov>
Cc: Chaffins, Randall <Chaffins.Randall@epa.gov>; Amoroso, Cathy <Amoroso.Cathy@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: ORR risk based instream values vs CWA guidance defaults

In the 3rd tab of the ORR Fish Default vs Site Specific ISWQV table are the comparison of values. I have pasted that information below. Let me know if you want to discuss.
Glenn

Radionuclide	"Site Specific ISWQV"	"CWA Defaults ISWQV"	25% of DOE's DCS
H-3	1.19E+06	1.43E+05	2.15E+05
C-14	1.93E-01	2.32E-02	1.55E+04
Cl-36	7.38E+02	8.89E+01	8.00E+03
Co-60	9.09E+01	1.09E+01	1.80E+03
Sr-90	7.72E+02	9.30E+01	2.75E+02
Tc-99	2.57E+03	2.32E+02	1.10E+04
I-129	2.61E+01	3.14E+00	8.25E+01
Cs-137	1.65E+00	1.98E-01	7.50E+02
Eu-154	8.34E+01	1.01E+01	3.75E+03
Pb-210	5.22E+00	6.29E-01	9.75E+00
Ra-226	7.49E+01	9.02E+00	2.18E+01
Ra-228	2.71E+01	3.27E+00	6.25E+00
Th-228	1.73E+02	2.09E+01	8.50E+01
Th-230	2.16E+02	2.60E+01	4.00E+01
Th-232	1.93E+02	2.32E+01	3.50E+01
U-233/U-234	1.68E+03	2.02E+02	1.65E+02
U-235/U-236	1.78E+03	2.15E+02	1.80E+02
Np-237	6.19E+01	7.46E+00	8.00E+01
U-238	1.85E+03	2.23E+02	1.88E+02
Pu-238	4.34E-02	5.23E-03	3.75E+01
Pu-239	4.22E-02	5.08E-03	3.50E+01
Am-241	4.79E+00	5.77E-01	4.25E+01

(pCi/L)
ISWQV - Instream Water Quality Value
Site specific uses 11 meals/year for 26 year duration

From: Adams, Glenn
Sent: Wednesday, November 3, 2021 5:15 PM
To: Ramon Torres (Torres.Ramon@epa.gov) <Torres.Ramon@epa.gov>
Cc: Randall Chaffins <Chaffins.Randall@epa.gov>; Amoroso, Cathy <Amoroso.Cathy@epa.gov>; Alexander, Shanna <Alexander.Shanna@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: ORR risk based instream values vs CWA guidance defaults

Ramon,
Greg and I were talking about something else and he mentioned that you were getting these tables together to share. He also asked if we had anything that compared the Site specific value vs the CWA Default vs the DOE 25% DCS values. Cathy and I added a

3rd work sheet that compares those 3 values. Everything else is the same as what Cathy sent this morning. I did not want to send it to him without going thru you.

Thanks,
Glenn

From: Amoroso, Cathy <Amoroso.Cathy@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 3, 2021 8:34 AM
To: Torres, Ramon <Torres.Ramon@epa.gov>
Cc: Adams, Glenn <Adams.Glenn@epa.gov>; Alexander, Shanna <Alexander.Shanna@epa.gov>
Subject: ORR risk based instream values vs CWA guidance defaults

Ramon,
Attached is a spreadsheet that shows the rad limits if calculated with CWA guidance defaults (second tab, column M) and calculated using site specific risk based approach (first tab, column M). Also attached is the write up of the fish meals derivation and supporting data.

Thanks,
Cathy

From: Alexander, Shanna <Alexander.Shanna@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, October 21, 2021 1:07 PM
To: Amoroso, Cathy <Amoroso.Cathy@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ORR (R4 & OLEM) - Paper for Discussion

Cathy,

See attached calculations for the site specific and default CWA instream water quality value calculations. It is important to note that the fish tissue concentrations are still under review and discussions will take place on this today and probably the next DRAT meeting. I added a table note to the calculation tables highlighting this. As always, let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Shanna